

—The small-farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, compared to 35 in the large-farm community.

—The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12-month period analyzed was \$4,383,000, compared to \$2,535,000 in the large-farm community.

—The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was more than three times as great in the small-farm community.

—The small-farm community supported a 20 per cent larger number of people per dollar volume of agriculture production.

—The people in the small-farm community had a better average standard of living.

—More than half of the breadwinners in the small-farm community were independently employed business men, persons in white-collar employment, or farmers; in the large-farm community, the proportion was less than one-fifth.

WAGE WORKERS

—Less than a third of the breadwinners in the small-farm community were agricultural wage laborers (characteristically landless and with low and insecure income); the proportion of persons in this position was nearly two-thirds of all persons gainfully employed in the large-farm community.

—Physical facilities for community living—paved streets, sidewalks, garbage disposal and other public services—were far greater in the small-farm community; in the large-farm community some of these facilities were entirely lacking.

—The small-farm community had four elementary schools and one high school while the large-farm community had just a single elementary school.

—The small-farm community had three parks for recreation, its counterpart a single playground, loaned by a corporation; the smalltown community also had twice the number of organizations for civic improvement and social recreation, and held a 2 to 1 edge in the number of churches.

RICHER LIFE

—Facilities for making decisions on community welfare through local popular elections were available to the people in the small community; in the large-farm area such decisions were in the hands of officials of the county.

These vast differences in the economic and social life of these two communities affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms.

And this belief, in a nutshell, is what opponents of corporation farming want to preserve.

DON RINGLER, *Farm Writer.*

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Bismarck, April 16, 1968.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It has come to my attention that your Senate Committee studying monopoly and small business is holding a hearing on May 20, in Omaha, regarding the effect corporation farming has on small business.

It is my belief that a broad base of private ownership of real estate and small business is absolutely essential to the health of our economic system. I am alarmed at the obvious trend of constantly merging business enterprises which, in some cases, stifle competition by bringing competitors into one company, and, in other cases, branch out to merge unrelated corporations to diversify investment. In the latter instance, this diversification has shown signs of including large agricultural land holdings.

It should not take a very sophisticated study to show that large corporation farming eliminates the need for small farm units living on the land. When small farm units are eliminated and the families who farmed them are moved to the cities, some very grave economic and social problems arise in the rural areas.